

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/867,652	05/31/2001	Michael Anthony Sijacic	06502.0340	7976	
60667	60667 7590 07/28/2006			EXAMINER	
	SYSTEMS/FINNEGAT	CUFF, MICHAEL A			
	901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•		3627		

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	09/867,652	SIJACIC ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Michael Cuff	3627		
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	opears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the maili earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 I This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1,3,4,7-13 and 21-23 is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1, 3, 4, 7-13 and 21-23 is/are rejector 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	ed.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examin	cepted or b) objected to by the E e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ction is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	(PTO-413)		
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	te atent Application (PTO-152)		

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-13 and 21-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art in view of Neely and Morinville.

The admitted prior art shows all of the limitations of the claims except for specifying a response disputing one or more line items and the specifics of the approvers from the purchasing entity.

From applicant's "background" section, conventional B2B EIPP systems allow businesses to have invoices presented, processed and paid through an intermediate service. In doing so, the intermediate service generally downloads an entire invoice from a provider of goods and/or services and enables the invoice to be managed on-line by both the provider and a purchaser. Although such services enable businesses to perform invoice processes electronically, dispute and payment processing is limited to the entire invoice.

Neely teaches an electronic invoicing and payment system where (column 5, top) the customer may pay less (a response reflecting one line item) than the amount due on the invoice for either unspecified reasons or for a specific reason such a dispute

concerning a line item contained on the invoice in order to communicate with the biller and to not pay for items not received.

Based on the teaching of Neely, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the conventional EIPP system to pay less than an invoice amount as a response to a disputed line item in order to communicate with the biller and to not pay for items not received.

Morinville teaches a signature loop authorizing method. The system assigns approval roles for certain functions. Paragraph 0069 specifically discusses the possibility "if two management levels are necessary for approval". This allows greater oversight for higher profile decisions.

Based on the teaching of Morinville, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the conventional EIPP system to incorporate authorization procedures for different actions including a second approval on some line items in order to allow greater oversight for higher profile decisions.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Cuff whose telephone number is (571) 272-6778. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 09/867,652 Page 4

Art Unit: 3627

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael Lift 7/29/06
Michael Cuff
July 24, 2006